

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to a Non-Final Office action dated January 29, 2007. Claims 1-11 and 13-23 were examined. By way of the present amendment, claims 4 and 21 are being canceled.

Claim 23 has been amended to address the informality noted in the Office action.

Claims 1-9, 11, and 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,451,912 to Torode (hereinafter, "Torode") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,882,214 to Spenea et al. (hereinafter, "Spenea"). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torode in view of Spenea, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,852 to Hauck (hereinafter, "Hauck").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-9, 11, and 13-23.

Claim 1 requires *control circuitry coupled to the terminal to permanently convert the terminal from a first mode of operation in which serial communications are received over the terminal into a second mode of operation in which the terminal functions to selectively enable an output according to a voltage value on the terminal*. Claim 1, as amended, further requires that the control circuit is responsive to a communication received over the terminal to convert the terminal to the second mode of operation. Torode teaches nothing about a permanent conversion and thus, no teaching of a command received over the terminal to achieve the permanent conversion to the second mode of operation. Spenea teaches the conversion in the embodiment in Fig. 4 is accomplished by means of an appropriate programming current to blow the fuse 33 to isolate pin 14 from the fuse array. Thus, the references, when combined, fail to teach claim 1 as amended. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the references of record.

Claim 10 has been put in independent form and stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torode in view of Spenea, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,670,852 to Hauck (hereinafter, "Hauck"). First, Torode teaches that an object of his invention is to provide a programmable crystal oscillator that does not require any dedicated programming connections. See col. 1, lines 64-66. Thus, Torode teaches away from any combination


incorporating a dedicated programming pin, rendering the combination of Torode with a reference teaching a dedicated programming pin improper. See MPEP §2145(X)(D). Further, claim 10 recites a dedicated programmable input/output terminal over which serial communications and a calibration clock are received. The Office action points to pin 120 of Hauck (Fig. 2) which is an input pin receiving a calibration clock signal. There is no teaching in Hauck that pin 120 receives serial communications as claimed. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable for this additional reason.

Claim 11 recites *permanently converting the terminal to a second mode of operation in response to a received command*. As pointed out above, Spenea teaches that the conversion in the embodiment in Fig. 4 is accomplished by means of an appropriate programming current to blow the fuse 33 to isolate pin 14 from the fuse array. Torode fails to make up for the shortcoming of Spenea and fails to teach *permanently converting the terminal to a second mode of operation in response to a received command*. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 11 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the references of record.

Claim 14 recites converting the terminal from the first mode to the second mode of operation in response to the command being received over the terminal. That is not shown in Torode or Spenea. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable for this additional reason.


Claim 19 has been amended and recites that the means for permanently converting *is responsive to a serial communication received over the terminal to convert the terminal to the second dedicated mode of operation*. As pointed out with respect to claim 14, that is not shown in Torode or Spenea. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 19 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the reference of record.

In summary, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-20, and 22-23 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed as shown above.	
<input type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the USPTO.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> transmitted using the USPTO electronic filing system.	
 Mark Zagorin	<u>4/30/07</u> Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Zagorin, Reg. No. 36,067

Attorney for Applicant(s)

(512) 338-6311 (direct)

(512) 338-6300 (main)

(512) 338-6301 (fax)